THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1918

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-six Branch Committees; 41,300 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, PRESIDENT
MRS. JOHN BALCH, VICE-PRESIDENT
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
} Honorary Vice-Presidents

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman
MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Legislative Committee
Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Membership Committee
Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Meetings Committee
Chairman
MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

Publicity Committee
Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interests League
President
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League
President
MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary
MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. A. H. PARKER

State Organizer
MISS ALICE D. W. WHITE

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

"INDEFINITELY POSTPONED"

After six months of active and unscrupulous campaigning in the United States Senate, the Federal Suffrage Amendment has been "indefinitely postponed."

This, of course, does not mean that the proposal will not be again brought forward, when the careful calculations of the suffragists lead them to think that they can command sufficient votes for their purpose; but the chance of their getting these votes diminishes as the months go by. Their incessant nagging, and the unfairness of their methods have weakened their cause.

On the 6th of May, the suffrage amendment received what the Boston *Herald* aptly described as "a jolt," when a motion proposing that the Senate consider the amendment on the following Friday failed to receive the required two-thirds vote. Chairman Jones of the Suffrage Committee made this motion at a time when fourteen Senators known to be opposed to the amendment were absent. Probably he thought that he could get the motion through under these favoring conditions. But the number of Senators voting for the motion fell nine short of even a majority of the Senate.

In spite of this failure, Senator Jones declared his intention of taking the resolution up on the Friday indicated. In the interval, however, new light came to him. The amendment received a second "jolt," when Senator Jones announced that its consideration was indefinitely postponed. He made no secret of the reason. He stated that, when he announced that the resolution would be taken up, "the committee had reasonable grounds to believe that, if brought to a vote, the amendment would receive the affirmative vote of at least two thirds of this body. Since that time, information has been received that causes the Committee to doubt that fact." He added: "It is so important that the amendment be not brought to a vote until there is a reasonable assurance of its passage that the Committee has decided not to ask immediate action by the Senate."

This was a frank admission that the suffragists were not willing to bring the resolution to a vote, because they had not enough votes, and knew that they hadn't. They had coaxed; they had entreated; they had threatened. They had brought every kind of pressure to bear upon individual Senators. They had promised dreadful reprisals at the fall elections to Senators who would not do what the suffragists wanted them to do. But they realized that, if the amendment came to a vote, it would be defeated.

Later, Senator Jones announced that the vote would be taken on the 27th of June. The suffragists, in the meantime, persuaded President Wilson to express his hope that the Senate would act favorably. They were so confident of success that they made joyous preparations to celebrate their anticipated victory.

The grounds of their confidence became apparent when the debate began before crowded galleries. Senator James of Kentucky, an opponent of suffrage, was ill, and had asked to be paired. Senator Jones refused to grant this courtesy — a refusal which ran counter to immemorial usage. Through the absence of Senator James, and the active aid of the two suffrage votes which should have been paired with him, Senator Jones hoped to carry the resolution. Senator Underwood of Alabama, speaking for the opponents of the resolution, stated that the resolution might be brought

to an immediate vote, if a pair were arranged for Senator James; but Senator Jones refused, and further action was blocked by Senators who were indignant at what Senator Reed of Missouri described as a setting aside of "courtesies and decencies."

The next day, the suffrage Senators sorrowfully decided that an "indefinite postponement" was the only course open to them. This means that they will watch for some other chance to secure an unfair advantage; but their outlook grows more gloomy with each new failure.

SUFFRAGE SHELVED IN MASSACHUSETTS

On the 25th of June, the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention accepted, by an overwhelming vote, the adverse report of the committee on the proposed woman suffrage amendment. On the next day, by a majority of more than two to one, it defeated a motion to reconsider its action. So the suffrage question was definitely shelved.

The Convention acted wisely in refusing to plunge the State, in the midst of the great war, into a suffrage campaign. Its members knew that, in November, 1915, Massachusetts voters had rejected woman suffrage by a majority of 133,447 — 352 towns and cities out of 354 voting against it; and there was no reason to suppose that they would vote differently, if the question were forced upon them again this year.

If Massachusetts suffragists had had even the faintest hope of being able to reverse the decision of 1915, they would certainly not have allowed the Convention thus to shelve the suffrage issue without at least a vigorous protest. Their inactivity shows that they agree with Mrs. Ida Husted Harper in the conviction that "Massachusetts will not grant the franchise to women *until compelled to do so by a Federal amendment.*"

In that single statement, made authoritatively by a suffrage leader, is summed up the purpose of the Federal amendment. It is meant to coerce and override the expressed convictions of Massachusetts voters by a process which makes such States as Nevada, with a population of 81,875, — less than that of the city of Somerville — as powerful as Massachusetts, in determining the general result. Its aim is to "compel" Massachusetts to accept suffrage conditions which it has emphatically rejected.

THE PUBLIC INTERESTS LEAGUE

The Public Interests League of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts held its annual meeting on May 27th at 687 Boylston Street, Boston. In the unavoidable absence of the President, the first Vice-President, Mrs. Frank B. Sanborn, presided, and gave a general report of the year's work.

A resolution was unanimously adopted by which the Unitarian members of the League repudiated the action of the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting, May 21st, in passing a resolution urging on the United States Senate the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

The speaker of the afternoon was Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, who described, to the intense interest of her audience, her recent trip to France, where she established in Paris, at the corner of the Rue de Rivoli and the Rue de Castiglione, a Bureau of Information for Massachusetts soldiers and sailors. The manager of this Bureau works in cordial cooperation with the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A., but there is room for all. Many men feel more free to take their perplexities to a bureau representing their own home state than to one of the larger organizations. Other states are following out this line of effort in behalf of their men, and Pennsylvania and Kansas already have representatives there. Mrs. Frothingham spoke with the utmost enthusiasm of our men, and of the pride which she felt in them, wherever she met them.

The following officers were elected: President, Mrs. B. L. Robinson; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank B. Sanborn and Mrs. Edwin Ford; Treasurer, Miss Evelyn Sears; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles B. Gulick; Recording Secretary, Miss Adelaide Proctor. Resolutions were passed regretting the absence of Mrs. Robinson, and appreciating her devotion to the work of the League.

IN spite of the frenzied efforts of the New York suffragists to secure as large an enrolment of women, May 25th, for the primaries, as possible, seconded by the determination of many anti-suffrage women to enroll, in order that they might use the political power forced upon them to work later for the repeal of suffrage, the enrolment of women, on the average, was less than half that of men. In some districts it was only about one third. What becomes of the claim that women are clamoring for the vote, and that they must have it, as "a war measure"?

THE vehement contest last May over the choice of First Vice-President of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association turned upon the question of the loyalty of the candidates. Both of the candidates officially put forward for the position were openly charged with lack of patriotism, and a third candidate — Mrs. Charles Sumner Bird — was nominated as a protest against the nominations officially made. Mrs. Bird, whom *The Woman Citizen* describes as "the loyalty candidate par excellence," was elected. But she owed her election to a division in the ranks of what may be described as the "pacifist" forces, some of whom voted for one of the official candidates and some for the other. The combined "pacifist" vote was 142; while Mrs. Bird received only 93 votes.

"THE WOMAN PATRIOT"

Anti-suffragists, the country over, will welcome the opportunity which *The Woman Patriot*, the new organ of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, gives them to follow, from week to week, the course of events and the current of thought and opinion regarding suffrage and anti-suffrage.

The name of the paper is wisely chosen, for it stands "For Home and National Defense Against Woman Suffrage, Feminism and Socialism" and so for the truest sort of patriotism. Its eight broad pages afford an opportunity to give the latest information regarding women's patriotic activities in all fields.

It is published at Washington by the Woman Patriot Publishing Company, at 1621 K Street for $1.00 a year, postpaid. It is edited by Miss Minnie Bronson, and Miss Charlotte E. Rowe is the Associate Editor. Mrs. Margaret C. Robinson, whose "Anti-Suffrage Notes" have been widely read, as a separate publication, contributes them as a weekly department; and Henry Watterson, Anna Katharine Green, Octave Thanet, Annie Nathan Meyer and Elizabeth Ogden Wood are the other contributing editors.

There could hardly be a better platform than this statement of the principles for which *The Woman Patriot* stands:

For balanced Government and balanced social organization.

For the maintenance of American morale and man-power to the last quarter of an hour.

For the defense of the Constitution of the United States against all foreign and domestic enemies.

For the constitutional right of each State to settle fundamental principles of local self-government for itself by popular vote.

For the preservation of the military and political power of man, and the non-partisan moral and educational power of woman.

For the conservation of womanhood and childhood against political and industrial exploitation.

For the exaltation of womanhood and motherhood against the *imitation-of-man* movement.

For the division of labor and duties between the sexes for the best interests of the family and the State, against the unbalanced political ambitions of all those who seek to arouse irresponsible individualism, the germ of autocracy, anarchy and sex antagonism.

For the basic principles of Democracy, majority rule and local self-government, against all policies of surrender to minority political machines.

For a strong and safe suffrage, based on man-power, the deciding factor in the defense of the nation and the enforcement of law.

For the exemption of women from unnatural responsibilities, voting duty, jury duty and political turmoil, in just recognition of their natural sacrifice and non-partisan service for the State.

SOME REASONS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

(Professor Thomas N. Carver of Harvard University, at the Annual Meeting of the Cambridge Anti-Suffrage Association, May 13, as reported in the Cambridge Chronicle, May 18.)

Woman suffrage is not of great importance in itself. It is only a straw which shows which way the wind of public opinion is blowing. That wind seems to be blowing toward individualism. The tendency is to make the individual the unit, rather than the family group. If it is true that the interests of the individuals making up the family group are not identical but conflicting, then of course each individual should have a vote to protect his own interests — the husband, to protect his against the wife; the wife, to protect hers against the husband.

But are the interests of men and women conflicting? Are they competitive? Are they not rather complementary? Bread and butter do not compete — on the contrary, bread creates a demand for butter. Lime and sand do not compete — the making of lime creates a demand for sand. The difference between men and women, and the need of each for the other, tends to identity of interests, not to conflict.

The tendency to individualism is an unwholesome one. The idea that marriage is an arrangement which concerns no one but the two individuals first involved, and that human beings may mate and re-mate as the birds do, is unfavorable to the interests of children. John Fiske has shown strikingly that the long, dependent infancy of the human species points to permanent marriage and monogamy. For the best development of the human stock, the family must be a permanent entity. Social organization must take this into account and fit it into its system.

If I thought that better government would result from extending the suffrage, or restricting it, I should favor either such change. I should be willing to follow the argument for woman suffrage to its logical conclusion. If the quality of the vote is improved by giving women the ballot, then women must be better voters than men, and not only should women be enfranchised, but men should be disfranchised. But there is no evidence that woman suffrage produces better government. The suffragists often match the name of Jane Addams against that of some conspicuous criminal or degenerate and say, "Don't you think she would make a better voter than he?" It is a shallow question, but it can be appropriately answered by matching the name of Dr. Eliot against that of some notorious female criminal, and asking whether his vote would be improved by adding hers.

There is no proof that women have improved conditions where they vote. The testimony of governors and other officials who have been elected by women's votes counts for very little. States where women do not vote lead in prohibition, child-labor reforms, and industrial legislation. In woman suffrage states, where the novelty has worn off, women take less interest in voting than men do.

It is a false theory which teaches that voting is a privilege; and a bad state of politics results from it. Voting is a duty, as working on roads is a duty in rural communities, and as paying taxes is a duty. A man or woman who regards the vote as a privilege is not fit to vote.

THAT was an edifying discovery which was made in Boston in Red Cross week, when it was found that suffrage leaders in a hut on Boston Common, surrounded by flags and Red Cross mottoes, and supposed to be collecting Red Cross funds, were actually soliciting signatures, from children as well as adults, to a petition to President Wilson, asking him to intervene in behalf of the Anthony amendment.

"THE SAME AS THE MEN"

The "wets" and the "drys" in the thirty-nine New York cities which voted at the local option elections last April were agreed upon one point. They both expected that the majority of the new women voters would vote against the saloons. The "wets" dreaded this, and the "drys" hoped for it; but both were in error. The net result was that, taking the group of cities as a whole, the women voted the same as the men.

The *New York Herald* of April 8 reported that the "big registration of women in up-state cities causes panic in wet forces." The liquor men, it said, "are thoroughly frightened" and "each side concedes the women will decide the liquor question." In Syracuse and other cities, the *Herald* went on to say, "the registration of women is surprisingly large. It appears that where the contests are the hardest fought the number of women going to the polls is proportionately larger. This is regarded as showing the women are going to vote dry."

In Syracuse, more than 40,000 women registered, and the number of women voting was more than the men. The "drys" placed Syracuse unquestioningly in their column. But what was the result? A majority of more than 12,000 for the "wets."

In Newburg, more than 4,500 women registered, and the interest was so great that 150 women made a house-to-house canvass to secure the registration of women. Yet the license advocates rolled up a majority of more than 2,000.

In New Rochelle, the registration books showed the names of 5,297 women, and 5,638 men; and the "drys" counted on carrying the city. The total vote cast was 9,500; and the license majority was 2,000.

Oswego was another city which was placed in the "dry" column before the election. The registration of women was 3,200; but the "wet" majority was more than 3,000.

In Schenectady, the "drys" made a strong fight, and counted upon the women's vote to expel the saloons, but the "wets" won by a majority of about 2,500.

In Mount Vernon, with a registered woman vote of 5,500, the license majority was 2,557.

In Amsterdam, 3,304 women voted for license, and only 2,165 against.

Of the thirty-nine cities voting, only three, — Syracuse, Schenectady and Binghamton, were of the second class. Of these, Binghamton only went "dry" and that by a small majority. Of the 36 third-class cities, 17 went "wet" and 19 "dry." The net result was that, of 2,132 licenses involved in the elections, more than 1,400 were retained.

There seems to be only one opinion as to the significance of this result. The *New York Mail*, suffragist, said editorially, April 22, "It shows about as even a division of sentiment among women voters on political issues as has been the rule among men voters." The *Philadelphia Telegraph* of April 20 said: "The women's vote, in most instances, was divided, much as was the vote of the men." The *New York Sun*, an ardent advocate of national prohibition, said regretfully: "The advocates of no-license expected the women to vote as a unit against the saloon. Their hopes were not fulfilled. The women electors divided about as the men did." The *New York Times* remarked: "Apparently the same result as before can now be had at twice the expense." The *Springfield Union* of April 20 said: "It is quite evident that the prohibitionists will have to revise their estimates as to the effect that woman suffrage will have on the cause that lies so close to their hearts." And the *New York Evening Post*, suffragist, said, April 18: "It is most difficult to see that the women's vote was, to any important extent, different from that of the men anywhere, with the possible exception of Ithaca. This result is not surprising, if similar elections elsewhere are considered. The women refused to vote California dry, for example. More and more it looks as if there was nothing so much like a man as a woman."

It is increasingly clear that, wherever the suffragists base their claim on the ground that "votes for women" will benefit the community, they seek support under false pretences.

NOT EASILY SCARED

On the 10th of May, when Senator Jones of the Suffrage Committee was forced to make the mortifying admission that he had not enough votes to secure the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and therefore would not move to take it up for consideration, he saw fit to threaten the Senators who opposed the amendment, warning them that the citizens of their states would "make it so warm for them that they will not dare" to vote against it. Thereupon, Senator Borah of Idaho, — himself a suffragist, and Senator from a suffrage State — said:

"I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico, in regard to this question of 'making it warm,' that there are some Senators on this floor who have been advocating woman suffrage for twenty-five years, long before the late New York election. These Senators have some convictions of their own. They believe each State should settle the matter for itself and are opposed to forcing it upon States that do not want it or by reason of peculiar local conditions are not prepared for it. I say, therefore, in answer to the Senator's suggestion, that no amount of telegrams which can be poured in here will have any effect upon the Senator from Idaho. Upon this subject he has views which are not subject to change."

Senator Borah is just finishing his twelfth year of service in the Senate. He will go before the voters of his State, men and women, next November, for re-election. If there were anything really to be dreaded in the suffrage threats of reprisals, Idaho might well be thought a State in which they might be effective. But Senator Borah is not moved by them. He stands up like a man for the things he believes in; and he thereby sets a good example to wavering statesmen, in or out of the Senate, whom the suffragists try to move by threats and bluster.

NEW YORK WOMEN AND THE VOTE

The position of the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party of New York is so misunderstood in some quarters and has been so misrepresented in others that it is worth while to have it clearly stated, as it was in the appeal sent to anti-suffrage women throughout the State, on the 8th of May. This appeal declared:

"The anti-suffrage women of New York State, enfranchised by men against our will, believe the ballot, however unwisely bestowed, to be a binding obligation. We have, therefore, determined to take up the political duties forced upon us, and to this end have organized ourselves into the Woman Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party, thus taking the customary and necessary means of 'getting out' our vote in use among men voters. This is particularly necessary for us because the vast mass of anti-suffragists throughout the State — the industrious home-keeping women, busy with the normal duties and responsibilities of women — do not wish to enter the political arena, and will be reluctant voters, whereas the radical, Socialist, feminist forces are fighting to get to the polls. . . . We must oppose with the full anti-suffrage strength of this State the passage by the United States Senate of the Suffrage Federal Amendment, both because it over-rides State right, and because it takes the decision of this question out of the hands of the people, where it belongs, and puts it in control of politicians in Congress and the legislatures, who in turn are controlled by suffrage lobbies. We women must remember that since becoming voters our position has changed. A new duty has been imposed upon us. We neglect it at the nation's peril."

For these reasons, the appeal called upon all women to register and enroll in a political party on the 25th of May, in order to use their influence in the selection of candidates, and to be able to vote in the primaries in September; and it defined as follows the purposes of the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party:

"The immediate purpose of the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party is to get out the anti-suffrage vote in order to oppose with our full strength the radical forces which have been greatly increased by the grant of woman suffrage in New York State. These forces, rampant in New York and all other congested centres throughout the State and country, boldly threaten revolution. Our ultimate purpose is the resubmission of woman suffrage in this State, in order that women themselves may be afforded an opportunity to vote on this question which most concerns them."

Both the immediate and the ultimate purpose defined in this appeal are consistent with the highest patriotism. The line of least resistance for the anti-suffrage women of New York, constituting a large majority of the women of the State, to follow would have been to say that, as they did not want the ballot and it had been forced upon them against their will, they would have none of it. But they recognize the fact that the dangers at present threatening the nation and the State are so serious that it becomes the duty of patriotic women as well as men to resist them with all their strength. At the same time, they declare their ultimate purpose to seek a re-submission of the suffrage amendment, in order that women themselves may have an opportunity to vote upon the question which most concerns them — an opportunity which it is the height of inconsistency for suffragists to oppose. As the *Brooklyn Eagle* of May 9th very forcibly said:

"There is no inconsistency at all in using, for what you believe to be the public interest, a vote which you did not ask for and did not want. We all of us perform as well as we can many duties that are unwelcome but are forced upon us. If the Antis in a hostile State can demonstrate by continued aggressiveness the vitalism of their feeling, they may yet do something to prevent other States from following New York's example, something to prevent the success of the Federal suffrage amendment."

NEW YORK suffragists could hardly have chosen a better way to advertise the close connection between suffrage and the most radical Socialism than by selecting Morris Hillquit to expound Socialist views at the party symposium of the Woman Suffrage Party of New York city on the 16th of May. Mr. Hillquit made his campaign for Mayor on the basis of opposition to the war, and to the Liberty loan, and he told the voters that a socialist victory would be "a clear mandate to our government to open immediate negotiations for peace." Naturally, he gathered in the pro-German vote, to a man; but his is not a personality that loyal Americans dote upon.

IN the so-called "victory calendar for 1917," which Senator Jones, acting for the suffragists, submitted to the Senate, May 10th, asking that it be inserted in the *Record* without reading, Ohio is credited with three "victories" — all of them in the Legislature, without any mention of the fact that suffrage was defeated at the polls last November by a majority of more than 146,000, and the suffrage legislation wiped out. Maine is credited with two "victories" — the vote in each branch of the Legislature for the submission of the suffrage amendment — but the fact that the amendment was defeated at the polls by a two-to-one majority is suppressed. Also three "victories" are set down to the credit of Indiana, in spite of the fact that all of the legislation referred to was thrown out by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional. A very illuminating victory calendar this.

FRENCH suffragettes have a new grievance. Not only does the unchivalrous French Parliament refuse to give them the vote; but the rationing authorities have issued new regulations under which women are excluded from the privileges of the distribution of tobacco by card. Against this outrageous and arbitrary discrimination the suffragette leaders vehemently protest. If they were familiar with the American suffrage slogans, they would say: "Are not women 'people'? Are they not citizens? Why should they not have equal rights to cigarettes?"

THE ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts was held on April 24th at the Hotel Brunswick. In spite of the absorbing demands of war work upon the members, the attendance was large, and keen interest was shown in the questions discussed.

The morning session, as usual, was a business conference. The President, Mrs. Thomas Allen, opened it with a short, practical address, and she was followed by Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. Donald Markham, President of the Connecticut Association, and Mrs. A. F. Dudley, President of the New Hampshire Association. In the informal discussion thus opened, Mrs. Benjamin Norton of Arlington, Mrs. George Sprague of Brockton, Mrs. George A. Libby of Everett, Mrs. George E. Wallace of Fitchburg, Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson of Cambridge and Mrs. Ansel G. Cook of Hartford took part. A telegram of appreciation was sent to Mrs. Henry Preston White, then engaged in work in Oklahoma. Mrs. Edwin Ford reported the success of the Business Women's Supper, held the previous evening. Mrs. A. J. George, for so many years closely identified with anti-suffrage work, spoke in behalf of the Third Liberty Loan. A buffet luncheon gave a pleasant opportunity for informal conference.

At the afternoon session, Mrs. Allen made a brief, pungent address, emphasizing the importance of keeping up both war work and anti-suffrage work, and urging members to see that their war work is at least done under neutral auspices. Too much anti-suffrage war work has been done under Woman Suffrage auspices, and the credit has been given to Woman Suffrage — we have been providing them with weapons to use against us. We must have the national outlook, and must work on a national scale. The new national paper must be supported. By going deeper into the work, we shall each feel a deepening enthusiasm.

The report of the last annual meeting was read by the Secretary, Mrs. Frank Foxcroft. In the absence of the Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, her report was also read by Mrs. Foxcroft. Regret at Mrs. Codman's absence was expressed by a rising vote.

The report of the Education and Organization Committee was read by Mrs. A. H. Parker. Mrs. John Balch reported on National work; Mrs. Herbert W. Lyman for the College Anti-Suffrage League; and Mrs. B. L. Robinson for the Public Interests League.

On motion of Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier it was voted to protest to the Boston Committee of Public Safety against the giving into the hands of a political organization — the Boston Equal Suffrage Association — the Boston campaign for weighing and measuring children under five years of age, and to ask the chair to appoint a committee to see that the protest is effectively presented. Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, and Miss Julia Prendergast were appointed.

Mrs. Thomas Allen, who has been Acting President of the Association since the former President, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald, resigned to devote herself to war work, was elected President. The other officers elected were: Vice-President, Mrs. John Balch; Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Curtis Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, Mrs. James M Codman; Recording Secretary, Mrs. Frank Foxcroft; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. A. H. Parker; Executive Committee, the Officers and Miss M. Louise Brown, Mrs. James D. Colt, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, Mrs. John F. Hill, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Harold Murdock, Mrs. Benjamin A. Norton, Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins, Miss Julia C. Prendergast, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Miss Evelyn Sears, Mrs. William P. Shreve, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Mrs. Rudolph Weld, Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Mrs. Henry Preston White, Mrs. J. Bertram Williams.

Mrs. Allen introduced as the first speaker of the afternoon Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, Vice-Chairman of the re-organized New York Association, who gave startling facts relating to conditions in New York State, which had led to the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment, and indicated the steps being taken to secure its repeal.

Miss Charlotte E. Rowe, Associate Editor of The Woman Patriot, spoke of the alliance between Socialism and Woman Suffrage, with special emphasis on the unfortunate results of unrestrained competition of women with men in industry.

It was voted that the following resolution be sent to the members of the United States Senate: "Realizing that as our nation plunges deeper into the perils of war, the dangers of woman suffrage become more evident and threatening, we earnestly urge you to vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment."

The meeting closed with a rising vote expressing to the National President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., grateful and affectionate appreciation of her leadership.

MISS BLACKWELL, in *The Woman's Citizen* for April 6, says: "All the forces of evil go into politics. They go in with all their might. Every ounce of strength in the armies of righteousness is needed to defeat them; and eternal vigilance is the price of safety." An admirable sentiment. Now will Miss Blackwell please apply it to the Second and Ninth wards of Chicago, where every ounce of strength in the armies of men voters was needed to prevent the women voters from electing two notoriously unfit candidates for Aldermen?

SUFFRAGE, FEMINISM AND INDUSTRY

(Douglas Jerrold on "The Feminist Movement: Its Danger and Its Difficulty" in *The English Review*, April, 1918.)

The keener social reformers supported the suffrage under the belief that once the right to the vote was established, men's superiority to women in the labor market (i. e., their claim to higher wages for equal work) could no longer be logically maintained and would inevitably be abandoned. The fact that the vote conferred *status*, and that the men's economic claim was based on an alleged difference of *function*, was merely not understood. It is on the question of what is and what is not the function of women that the whole economic position turns. It is this confusion of thought that is responsible for much of the ignorant and bitter writing about women's subjection to men. Man as the breadwinner and woman as the housekeeper implies no difference in status, and consequently no humiliation to women. . . . Whether child-nurture and housekeeping are indeed the function of women is debatable. We may, perhaps, by way of reaction from the strenuous years in the trenches, breed a generation of men who will wish to stay at home and mind the children while their wives go out to earn the necessary means of subsistence, but whether women will agree to this tacit inversion of normally recognized functions is doubtful. Perhaps the true feminist view is that which is held by Mr. W. L. George, that housekeeping and home management is nobody's function; that a home is an abomination.

Women may wish to substitute dependence on the capitalist for dependence on the family, but they had better know what they are doing first. As long as they talk about economic freedom it is clear that they do not. References to the *common humanity* of women, to the "legitimate desire of women to share in the *common* work of the world," the doctrine of equality universally applied — such gleanings from philosophical Radicalism must go overboard if any one is ever to understand what feminism really means. Liberty, liberalism and humanity have little to do with a problem which is concerned mainly with psychology, physiology and economics. And the sooner the feminist leaders realize this the better. . . .

The idea that "equal wages for equal work" would afford any satisfactory solution of the problem raised by the entry of women into industry is totally false. Conditions against which men have been rebelling for years can hardly be deemed paradise for women. To imagine that one can free women by adding to their present disabilities a compulsory entry into wage-earning slavery is indeed an amazing contribution to political thought. Yet this is what the catchword, if taken seriously, amounts to. The main cause which has operated to keep down women's wages has been that wages are based on the amount necessary to the subsistence of the employee. *This cause will operate to lower men's wages* in proportion as women's wages *increase*. *This, again, will make adult female labor a necessity* if the home is to be kept going *at the present standard of comfort.*

Break down the last lingering traditions of capitalist honor, which regards the workingman as, at any rate, so much of a human being that his wages must be capable of supporting a family; establish communal creches to relieve an under-educated proletariat of the one useful interest in life which modern society allows them; flood the cinemas; maintain the profits of the drapers and the manufacturers of cheap jewelry at 150 per cent.; break up the unity of the home and provide cheap divorce on a lavish scale — and then we shall know that women have entered at last into the wage-earners' paradise.

HOW ABOUT THAT UPLIFT?

No city in the country needs regenerating, both morally and politically, more than Chicago. And there are the women voters who, according to the suffragists, are eager to do the work. How are they doing it?

That prominent suffrage newspaper, *The New York Evening Post*, tells us in the following editorial in its issue for April 9:

"In two wards the women, voting alone, would have elected a different Alderman from the one chosen in Chicago last Tuesday, and *in each case they would have given the place to an unfit candidate*. One of these wards was the Second, in which the men voted, 3,900 to 3,200, for a candidate who is a member of the Legislature and was commended by the Legislative Voters' League for a "record of growing usefulness." The women voted 2,759 to 2,705 for a candidate whom the Municipal Voters' League condemned by declaring: '*No Alderman in Chicago's history piled up a worse record in so short a time.*"

"In the Ninth Ward the men voted 3,300 to 2,900 for the candidate endorsed by the League, while *the women voted* 1,700 *to* 1,600 *for the candidate of the Thompson-Lundin machine.*'

In these two wards, at least, the men voters, the majority of whom wanted a good city government and Aldermen with a decent record, had to offset and overcome the votes given by a majority of the women for the worst candidates in the field. Happily they succeeded, but "votes for women" made it harder than it need have been or otherwise would have been.

A single concrete instance like this, sorrowfully admitted by a leading suffrage newspaper, counts for more than any amount of suffrage rhetoric and boastful talk of the uplifting influence of women in politics. The 2,759 women who voted in the Second Ward for the candidate whom the Municipal Voters' League described by saying "No Alderman in Chicago's history piled up a worse record in so short a time" knew what they were doing, and the sort of man they were voting for. So with the women voters in the Ninth Ward, the majority of whom voted for the candidate of the Thompson machine, and would have elected him had it not been for the adverse men's vote. Certainly the Bathhouse Johns and the "Hinky Dink" McKennas of Chicago have no just complaint as to the way woman suffrage is working out in that city. And A. J. Cormak, secretary of the liquor organization known as the United Societies, may well feel that the statement which he made five years ago, that "now that suffrage is a reality we shall organize our women, and expect to have no difficulty in getting results at the polls," is abundantly sustained.

EXPLOITING PATRIOTISM

At a special meeting and war luncheon of chairmen of local branches of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Assotiation at the home of Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, 163 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, May 16, it was voted to make public the following statement regarding the unscrupulous attempts of the suffragists to make capital for their cause out of the war and relief work done by their association:

"There is a growing indignation among patriotic women of Boston and vicinity at a type of suffrage camouflage too frequently practiced. A suffragist asks some anti-suffrage acquaintance to assist in what purports to be a patriotic undertaking. The latter agrees and learns with amazement that she is announced as patroness at a suffrage ball, or as helping on a suffrage committee, which will get the credit of her work. One of the latest examples of this method is in connection with the baby-weighing and measuring campaign. The invitation to the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association and to the Public Interests' League of Anti-Suffragists to assist in this campaign gave no suggestion that the work was under suffrage auspices; but when the plans for the enrolment of volunteers from our league were received it was learned with amazement that our volunteers were expected to enroll under the Boston Equal Suffrage Association. The enrolment blank is headed:

War Service Committee Boston Equal Suffrage Association of Good Government,
167 Tremont Street, Boston
Beach 6311.

"'The Child Welfare Committee of the Boston Public Safety Committee, which is affiliated with the Massachusetts Council of National Defence, has asked the Boston Equal Suffrage Association to organize the weighing and measuring of the children of Boston under five years of age, etc.'

"The matter was taken up with members of the Boston Public Safety Committee, who declared that the work had not been turned over to the Equal Suffrage Association, that Association being only one of several whose help had been asked. But the press, as well as the circular letters and enrolment blanks sent out by the suffragists, had disseminated the above statement broadcast.

"Similarly, the suffragists have announced in the press that they were to open the Red Cross drive with a rally at the Copley-Plaza on May 13. The Red Cross drive does not begin, as it happens, until the following week, and the authorities at the head of the Red Cross say they had given no sanction for any such use of their name by the suffragists. Such tactics on the part of the suffragists seriously injure the causes with which they seek to ally themselves for advertising purposes, and patriotic associations will soon be obliged to protect themselves from such unwarranted use of their names. Tickets have been sold to anti-suffragists for entertainments without allowing it to be known that they were under suffrage auspices, but the money turned in will, of course, be credited to the suffragists.

"Anti-suffragists are enrolled by the thousands in every non-political patriotic work — the Red Cross, Special Aid, Surgical Dressings, work for the soldiers and sailors, etc. There is a growing indignation on their part at what seems like an attempt to trick them into helping a cause with which they have no sympathy, and which will make political capital our of their patriotic service. Anti-suffragists are advised before undertaking new forms of war work hereafter to make sure that its motive is patriotism, not politics.

There would surely seem impropriety in neutral organizations for war relief allowing a political party to advertise itself through them."

(Signed)

Mrs. THOMAS ALLEN, President, Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association.

Mrs. B. L. ROBINSON, President Public Interests League of Anti-Suffragists.

WOMEN AND INDUSTRY

Readers of THE REMONSTRANCE may remember a quotation in the issue of last July from *Il Giornale Italiano* of New York, in which it was argued that woman's work in men's occupations tends to the disadvantage of man's work, and that the competition of woman in the field of labor has upon the wages of men an influence more disastrously hurtful than the competition of Negroes, Chinese or Hindus.

The same view is taken by Douglas Jerrold, in the trenchant article elsewhere quoted from the *English Review* for April. Mr Jerrold argues that men's wages have been based largely on what is regarded as necessary to enable a workman to support a family; and that, in proportion as the number of women in industry and the wages paid them increase, the wages of men will be lowered. Or, on the simple principle of supply and demand, the more competitors there are for a job, the lower the price paid for the job. The conclusion which Mr. Jerrold reaches is that "To imagine that one can free women by adding to their present disabilities a compulsory entry into wage-slavery is indeed an amazing contribution to political thought."

One of the equalities upon which suffragists insist is "equal pay for equal work." They would make this an indispensable condition even of the various forms of war industry which so many women are entering from motives of pure patriotism. Yet, under ordinary circumstances and in most industries, women's work, for which "equal pay" is demanded, cannot be equal to men's work. This because of women's natural disabilities; because of their inferior strength and endurance; and because they work more fitfully, the great majority of them being still drawn toward marriage and the home, in spite of the feminist teaching that the home is an abomination.

In any calculation of the relation of women's work and wages to men's, it must be borne in mind that existing conditions are not normal. The war is making an enormous drain upon the man-power of the country. But when the war is over, the men — most of them, it is devoutly to be hoped — will come back to the positions which they left at their country's call; and they will view with impatience, to say the least, any movement to crowd them out or to cut down their just pay through women's labor.